DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 127 UD 010 872

AUTHOR	Shaftel, Fannie R.; Robinson, John T.
TITLE	Intergroup Workshop for Special Training on Problems of School Desegregation. Interim Report, Final Report and Follow-Up in Participating School Districts.
INSTITUTION	Stanford Univ., Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	65
CONTRACT	OEC-5-37-025
NOTE	57p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Civil Rights; Curriculum Planning; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Institutes (Training Programs); Integration Plans; *Intergroup Relations; *Race Relations; *School Integration
IDENTIFIERS	California

ABSTRACT

Participants consisted of thirteen teams of teachers, administrators, and supervisors from ten school districts of the West: fifty-six in all, from several cities and suburban areas that presented de facto segregation. Large and small group discussions, evening sessions, library work, tape recordings, and films were utilized by the participants. The first week was comprised of topics such as civil rights, the need for desegregation and integration, and "complacency shocking" experiences. The second week concentrated on curriculum and discussion of community practices. Individual and team production of plans for furthering integration made up the third week's activities. The workshop, a live-in experience, was held at Stanford University from August 2, 1965 through August 25, 1965. (Authors/CB)

ED056127

INTERGROUP WORKSHOP FOR SPECIAL TRAINING ON PROBLEMS OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Under a Grant of U.S.O.E., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, through Provision of Title IV, Section 404, of Public Law 88-352, The Civil Rights Act of 1964

Reported by: Fannie R. Shaftel, Director

and

John T. Robinson, Associate Director

Program Director: Fannie R. Shaftel

Contract Number: 85-4200-24
P.L. 88-352, Title IV, Section 404
The Civil Rights Act of 1964

Date Transmitted: August 24, 1965

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD 010 872

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Institute on Desegregation

California

Garfield Junior High School - Team 1
Berkeley Unified School District
Berkeley, California
Thomas C. Walker, Coordinator of Intergroup Education
Ora D. Arnold Teacher
Doris E. Davie Teacher

New Haven Unified School District - Team 2
Decoto Elementary School
725 Whipple Ave.
Union City, California
Refugio Cabello, Principal
Joyce Maycroft Teacher
Dean Marshall Teacher

Ravenswood School District - Team 3
Brentwood Elementary School
Clarke Ave. and Donohoe
East Palo Alto, California
William Rybensky, Principal
Edna Wiswell Teacher
Elsie Darling Teacher
Vera Boysen Teacher

Richmond Elementary School District
City-wide Committee Team - Team 4
Richmond, California
Mr. John Scharetg, Vice Principal, De Anza Jr.-Sr. High School
James Napper, Teacher
Robert B. Muller, Principal elementary school
Dorothy Staley, Teacher
Kathryn Marston, Teacher

Richmond Elementary School District
Stege School - Team 5
Richmond, California
Barbara Thollaug, Counselor
Florence Hicks Teacher
Ila Warner Teacher

San Francisco Unified School District - Team 6
Raphael Weill School
c/o Office of the Superintendent
135 Van Ness Ave.
San Francisco 2, California

Emory Mellon, Asst. Principal
Altheda Carrie, Teacher
Michael Holway, Teacher
Alice Shikamura, Teacher (Fremont School)

Sausalito School District - Team 7
Richardson Bay School
c/o Sausalito School District, Box 95
Sausalito, California 94965

Robert D. Thomson,	Principal
Armando Flores	Staff
Virginia Grantham	Teacher
Elizabeth Jones	Teacher
Bonnie Clark	Teacher

Colorado

Denver Public Schools
Wyatt School, - Team 8
c/o Denver Public Schools, Administration Building
414 Fourteenth Street
Denver, Colorado

James Ward,	Principal
Buddy L. Burson	Coordinator
Ernest E. Pech	Coordinator Curriculum Services
Helen F. Agee	Teacher
Melva Hite	Teacher

Smith School - Team 9
c/o Denver Public Schools, Administration Building
414 Fourteenth Street
Denver, Colorado

Frances R. Davis,	Principal
James N. Manley	Assistant Principal
Elizabeth Deal	Teacher
Marian P. Haguewood	Teacher
Joy T. Wilson	Teacher

Nevada

Matt Kelly School - Team 10
c/o Clark County School District, Box 551
Las Vegas, Nevada

John Walker,	Principal
H. T. Hallberg,	Coordinator of Counseling and Psychological Services
Kay Felska	Teacher
Margaret York	Teacher
Annie Norwood	Teacher

Oregon

Sabin Elementary School - Team 11
Portland Public Schools
631 NE Clackamas St.
Portland, Oregon 97208

Bernard Farrell,	Principal
Shirley Shandy	Teacher
Charles Anthony	Teacher
Margit Anderson	Teacher
Dale Smith	Teacher

Vernon Elementary School - Team 12
Portland Public Schools
631 NE Clackamas St.
Portland, Oregon 97208

Henry Mascall	Principal
Nicholas Kirchner	Teacher
Mary Frances Gerber	Teacher
Anna Knutson	Teacher

Washington

Franklin High School - Team 13
Seattle School District #1
3013 South Mt. Baker Boulevard
Seattle, Washington 98144

Loren Ralph,	Principal
Jack Greaves	Asst. Superintendent for Secondary Schools
Reuben Krein	Teacher
Peggy Waxdal	Teacher
Duane Strinden	Teacher

Participants. Participants consisted of thirteen teams of teachers, administrators and supervisors from ten school districts of the West: fifty-six in all, plus a consultant team of four teachers from a San Francisco parochial school.

California: Berkeley Unified School District
Garfield Junior High School
New Haven Unified School District
Decoto Elementary School
Ravenswood School District
Brentwood Elementary School
Richmond Elementary School District
De Anza Jr.-Sr. High School
Stege Elementary School
San Francisco Unified School District
Raphael Weill School
Sausalito School District
Richardson Bay School

Colorado: Denver Public Schools
Wyatt School
Smith School

Nevada: Clark County School District
Matt Kelly School

Oregon: Portland Public Schools
Sabin Elementary School
Vernon Elementary School

Washington: Seattle School District #1
Franklin High School

There were seven central staff personnel, including an assistant superintendent, coordinators and special teachers; fourteen principals and vice principals. The main group were elementary, junior and senior high school teachers. In this total group there were twelve Negro-Americans, two Mexican-Americans, and one Japanese-American.

Permanent Staff:

Fannie R. Shaftel, Director.
Associate Professor of Education, Stanford University
Areas of specialization: Elementary Education, Social Studies, Role-playing, and other spontaneity techniques.

John T. Robinson, Associate Director.
Professor of Education, San Francisco State College
Areas of specialization: Social Foundations, Elementary and Secondary Education, Sensitivity training media, Social Studies.

Elizabeth Hall Brady, Staff Member.
Associate Professor of Education, San Fernando Valley State College
Areas of specialization: Psychological Foundations, Early Childhood Education, Secondary Education, Sensitivity training media.

Marie Fielder, Staff Member.
Division of Teacher Education
University of California, Berkeley
Areas of specialization: Social Foundations, Secondary Education, Literature, Negro History and the Civil Rights Movement.

All staff members have had extensive experience in intergroup education--on the Intergroup Project of the American Council of Education, the Los Angeles Human Relations Project and in the Intergroup Workshop of Stanford University.

Consultants

1. Dr. Fritz Redl — Distinguished Professor, Education
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan

2. Dr. Paul DeHart Hurd — Professor of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, California

3. Dr. Sanford Dornbusch — Professor of Sociology
Chairman, Department of Sociology
Stanford University
Stanford, California

4.	Mrs. Mary Karam	Lecturer San Francisco State College San Francisco, California
5.	Dr. Stephen Owokoya	Permanent Secretary Ministry of Education Nigeria
6.	Mrs. Ann Jones	Parent Counselor Oakland Public Schools Oakland, California
7.	Mr. James Duggins	Teacher, Compensatory Education Mission High School San Francisco City Schools San Francisco, California
8.	Dr. Stuart Loomis	Professor of Education San Francisco State College San Francisco, California
9.	Mrs. Irene Miller	San Francisco Redevelopment Agency 1269 McAllaster San Francisco, California
10.	Miss Josephine Cole	San Francisco Youth Agency Program Hunters Point 1598 36th Ave. San Francisco, California
11.	Dr. Hilda Taba	Professor of Education San Francisco State College San Francisco, California
12.	Dr. Richard Foster	Superintendent San Remos Unified School District Walnut Creek, California
13.	Dr. Watt Long	Educational Director Northern California Branch, National Conference of Christians and Jews Tower Building San Francisco, California

<u>Special Consultants</u>

St. Agnes School, Archdiocese of San Francisco
443 Church St., San Francisco, California

1.	Sister Mary Bernadette Giles	Administrator
2.	Sister Timothy Stuckey	Elementary Teacher
3.	Sister DePaul Pooley	Elementary Teacher
4.	Sister Mary Patricia Wilson	Elementary Teacher

THE TRAINING WORKSHOP (INSTITUTE ON DESEGREGATION)

The General Make-up of the Institute Group

Members of the Institute group were invited from several cities and suburban areas of the West that presented de facto segregation of various degrees of intensity. The purpose in inviting persons from these cities was to provide an opportunity to explore different kinds of problems and issues which might emerge when the groups from the various places confronted each other's problems and the participants' descriptions of them.

Another factor taken into account in selecting the participating school systems was that the administration expressed an interest in having members of their school systems attend. The importance of this factor, we thought, would insure that people attending the Institute would have the support of their administrations in implementing any plans they might make when they returned to their respective positions in the Fall of 1965.

School districts were invited to send team groups from the same school made up, where possible, of teachers, an assistant principal or principal, or a person from the central staff. The staff considered this policy especially important as both research and experience has shown that when people develop ideas and plans in teams, implementation of these plans is more feasible and more effective.

The participants, then, came from ten school systems with different needs and problems, were prepared to work in teams from their districts, and had, in general, the support of their administrations in attending the Institute. The list of participating school systems and teams is attached to this report.

Pre-planning of the Institute

The staff as a whole met for one day early in Spring to set up general guide lines for the Institute and to plan a method of approach to secure the active involvement of participants in the Institute from the start. The director spent the month of May in formal preparation, but also did much informal planning with school districts from February through July. Two general guidelines were agreed upon in addition to the need for early and continuous involvement of participants in the development of the Institute: The Institute should be structured around the problems which participants identified for themselves and, in addition, the staff had (a) the responsibility of identifying "blindspots" in participants' problem statements and of supplying information which might serve the purpose of illuminating and, in some cases, expanding the consideration of the original problem statements, and (b) the task of extending basic understandings of the tasks of desegregation and integration.

In addition, the staff took the responsibility of gathering bibliographies, and materials and books which might be found useful during the Institute. There was, however, no intention of requiring the use of all the materials gathered, but rather to have a reservoir of aids which could be used by the total group, and by small groups and individuals as the needs for them developed in the course of the Institute.

In order to facilitate the feeling of being a member of a team and emphasizing that teams would be expected to work on their own problems with the help of staff and other consultants, a questionnaire was distributed to each team asking them to identify together the problems as they saw them and what help they, as a group thought they might need.

Moreover, these questionnaires could be used by the staff as useful in planning, to identify the first levels of perceptions of problems as teams saw them. The staff was, of course, aware that the first problem statements would likely be revised as participants questioned each other and as the staff reviewed relevant information related to the problem statements when the participants arrived.

The staff also wished to know how each participant privately perceived the crucial problems which his school faced in the area of desegregation and attendant problems. An individual questionnaire was used for this purpose prior to the Institute. This questionnaire attempted to tap not only the participants' individual perceptions of the most crucial problem in this area, but to secure their interpretations of how parents, the community in general, and the students perceived the same problem. This questionnaire was sent the individuals and returned by them directly to the staff, since people cannot always afford to say in a personalized work group all they feel and see in the situation in which all are currently involved. These questionnaires helped to alert the staff to the range of problems and feelings that might exist in the small groups and in the total group and to indicate in a rough way the kinds of sessions which might need to be provided to extend people's sensitivity to problems related to desegregation.

The staff decided on a tentative time allotment for small and large group sessions. Because of some consultants' schedules, it was necessary to anticipate some needs even before we had reviewed the material from participants and to work the more personalized work schedule around

these commitments. However, it needs to be said that the staff saw as its central responsibility that of helping the teams to clarify their problems and plan a course of action.

The staff also planned a tentative sequence for the first week, which was subject to revision as new needs emerged. Since this sequence will be described more fully in the next section, it is not included here.

Organization

The following description of the Institute program attempts to show the progression of involvement of participants in the planning as well as the content of the program. The general plan for the use of time was large or small group sessions from 9 to 12 a.m. and from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m. Evening sessions were held as needed, averaging three evenings each week. In addition, a library of selected books and articles was set up in a separate room. A listening room was also established for the use of participants during any free time, supplied with a wide variety of tape recordings on a range of topics related to desegregation and problems attendant to it. This room proved to be very popular, often being used in the evening as well as during the afternoon. A number of movies were also available for small group viewing.

All participants and staff lived in the same dormitory. This aspect of the Institute seemed especially important as it provided an opportunity for integrated live-in experiences and for small groups to meet informally and pursue topics developed in the sessions in any way they chose. For example, a men's group on the third floor met so regularly to discuss issues that it became known as the "Third Floor Seminar".

Several participants indicated that this informal exploration of issues was one of the most important aspects of the Institute. It needs to be emphasized here that the range of problems brought to the Institute by persons from school systems throughout the Western states contributed to the enrichment of these informal discussions.

The staff and their functions

The permanent staff has had long experience in working together on various problems of human relations; this proved to be a distinct advantage as a problem-centered way of working was already established and planning, therefore, to meet the needs of participants was facilitated. Each staff member was assigned to a group of teams from cities in which that staff member will carry major responsibility for follow-up. While all staff members were available for consultation with all teams in the development of their plans, the assigned staff member was given the responsibility for continuity planning during the entire Institute.

An informal coffee hour was held Sunday afternoon to greet arrivals. The first meeting of the total group was held on Sunday evening before the workshop began officially on August 2nd. This meeting was designed as an informal conversation session to help participants meet each other and to meet the staff. To facilitate the conversation, the staff asked the teams to describe in a general way the problems related to desegregation as they viewed them in their communities. This session ran about two hours; no attempts were made to summarize or categorize the statements. Rather, the staff asked questions for clarification; this role was assumed by participants, of course.

Program

On Monday morning we were fortunate to have Dr. Norton Sobel open our workshop with a discussion of problems and issues related to desegregation on the national scene and the role of individuals and institutions related to it. In the afternoon, two teams, selected by the staff, described the projects they proposed to work on while at the Institute. These presentations were used as samples to which the staff and other participants reacted in order to help delineate the project in greater detail and to plan ways of developing it.

The reason for this meeting was two fold; to begin the process of sharing ideas and plans while they were being developed, and to help all teams view their problems in greater perspective than they had previously, by seeing their problems in contrast to those of other participants in other communities.

Rationale

Before describing the general content of the Institute, a discussion of the rationale for organizing the sessions seems in order. Plans for including needed content to expand participants' perceptions of their problems was developed on a week-to-week basis. General sessions were spaced around worktime for the teams to develop their plans for action when they got home. More of these general sessions were planned for the early days of the Institute, inccreasing the work time during the last week to permit as much team work on their own problems as possible. Even so, most teams worked far longer hours during the third week than the schedule called for.

Part of our general strategy was (a) to build immediately on the perceived problems of the participants and also (b) to provide for experiences the staff deemed necessary. Under this last category it may be helpful to state that it was hypothesized that the first week would be concerned with civil rights, the need for desegregation and integration, and "complacency shocking" experiences, to help all participants confront their own feelings, assumptions and practices. The second week was planned to provide content (through staff and consultants) on curriculum and to discuss community practices that have been productive. The third week was to be focused on individual and team production of their own plans, using materials and ideas gained through the Institute in furthering integration within their own school systems.

The first week included total group meetings, each of these meetings focused on the particular problems of the various team groups. They were led by a staff member with other staff members participating as summarizers and clarifiers. Two such general sessions were held. Two small group sessions were also held, with staff serving as consultants, to enable teams to make restatements of their problems and to begin setting for themselves a course of action.

Two general sessions were included during this week in addition to that of Dr. Sobel's which is described above. Dr. Fritz Redl discussed prejudice and discrimination as it is related to personality and to various kinds of social settings. These discussions served several teams especially well as their problems were focused on school planning for more adequate participation of all children in the school community.

Fannie Shaftel described an anthropological study of a small community in Central California with special focus on ethnic cleavage in the schools--a community made up of Mexican-Americans and "Anglos"--to highlight the subtle kinds of segregation that exists in many so-called integrated communities. This study engendered a considerable discussion of psychological segregation which exists in so many communities and schools, and stimulated a reevaluation of their own communities and their problems from this point of view by the participants.

A field trip to San Francisco ended the week on Friday. The group met with Stuart Loomis of San Francisco State College and representatives of the redevelopment agency in the city, then walked around selected neighborhoods in small groups during the afternoon. This activity was included for two reasons (1) to help participants learn to read the "social map" of a community and (2) to become more sensitive to the kinds of resources that exist in communities to help the school in interpreting the community as seen from different perspectives.

In order to get some assessment of the developing program of the Institute a reaction sheet was distributed during the early part of the second week (see attached). A brief summary of what appeared to be most helpful to participants seems appropriate here, since the staff would use this information to complete plans for the remaining days of the Institute. In addition to this information, the staff made its own diagnosis of needs for planning and pacing the last half of the Institute.

Reaction sheets summary

Twenty-four people indicated that speakers were the most

valuable to them; thirty-nine people indicated team-staff conferences, discussions, and exchange of ideas as most important to them. The opportunity to focus on their own problems was mentioned specifically by eleven people, but is of course implied in the statements of the previous thirty-nine.

Cross-team explorations

The staff felt that opportunities to discuss problems with persons other than team members were important, so two such sessions were included during the second week. The following ways of grouping were used: Around the topics of school culture and its effect on children, the role of play in the development and education of young children, the selection of content and experiences in social studies. These groups were led by staff members either alone or in teams of two. The second way of grouping was by age level of children (young children, intermediate, high school) to discuss any experiences or problems the group decided upon. These groups were also led by staff members.

The second week the focus was on practical ways to approach problems of integration in order to facilitate teams' work on their plans for Fall. This week was opened by a Monday morning general session in which Paul Hurd reported on the findings of a special committee of the National Science Foundation on guidelines to teaching children who have been disadvantaged for various reasons. The recommendations of this report provided a very provocative point of departure into curricular considerations. Other general sessions during that week reported on action projects which were illustrative of effective planning to meet the needs of representative

classes and schools.

Included in these sessions were (a) a description by Marie Fielder of the development of a parent group in a de facto segregated community which included parents from all segments of the community, (b) a description by a fifth grade teacher (Mary Karam) of her work with a group of students from two separate neighborhoods which were integrated in the same school for the first time, (c) a description by a parent counselor (Ann Jones) who works in a desegregated neighborhood in the East Bay, and (d) a description by a high school teacher of compensatory education (James Duggins) working in a semi-segregated neighborhood of a large city.

Two evening sessions were included, one "just for fun" as an Institute committee described it. This was an informal community sing in the lounge. The other was a speech by Dr. Stephen Awokoya, Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Education from Nigeria, on how an African views the racial scene in the United States.

Dr. Awokoya's moving account of his reaction to the plight of Negro-Americans occurred on Tuesday evening of the second week. On Thursday of that week our newspapers, radio, and television were full of the accounts of the Los Angeles riots in Watts. Our gradually developing rapport and new friendships between Negro and white participants made this even more painful for us all. We decided we needed a general session to discuss the import of this tragic event. The staff conducted this session on Thursday afternoon. We discussed the riot as a symptom of deep-seated frustrations and hopelessness, and drew upon Kenneth Clark's account in Dark Ghetto, of the 1964 riot in Harlem and on Ralph Ellison's account of

such an event in Invisible Man. This session was followed up in the "Third Floor Seminar" and by a request for a discussion evening on Civil Rights movements, which was provided the following week. Needless to say, this crisis in American life served to high-light the importance of each participant's role in his school and community.

The third week was given to team groups completing their plans for the Fall. Staff members who will be responsible for follow-up in participating districts worked closely with the teams in developing these specific plans. Only two general sessions were held with outside speakers. Hilda Taba described a new research study in the cognitive styles of elementary school children, using social studies content to illustrate teaching strategies related to these styles, and delineating the implications of her analysis for various sub-cultural groups of children. Richard Foster, a school superintendent, who has just completed a survey of a small community in California which will completely de-segregate its de facto segregated schools this September, described both the methods of the study and the development of plans to end segregation in this community. A panel of Institute participants responded to his description.

During the week, the need for introducing participants to various curricular media and resources became evident. Various small sessions (optional) were provided. A participating principal (Robert Muller) presented a rationale and plan for individualizing the reading program. He provided materials for teachers and led a discussion of the problems and procedures. Marie Fielder presented an analysis of clique structures in a high school and Elizabeth Brady guided a discussion of

the educational implications of the social structure of a school. Elizabeth Brady and John Robinson presented a range of sensitivity training materials and procedures, utilizing the intergroup materials they had developed in the American Council on Education Intergroup Project. Fannie Shaftel made a presentation on the curricular uses of role-playing and led the group in a role-playing session.

The last night session was devoted to a "creative evening" of singing, musical performances and a "play" based upon a section of Lillian Smith's Killers of the Dream, written and organized by one of the participants (Ora Arnold). The program is attached to this report.

The final day of the Institute was given to each team describing what it considered to be the most important action it planned to take in the Fall. The Institute ended with luncheon; a number of people lingered to talk, but most were on their way within a couple of hours.

(It should be noted that Dr. Watt Long, Educational Director, Northern California Chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, served as a guide and contact person for us during planning and throughout the Workshop. His help was invaluable.)

Follow-up

Each of the four regular staff members will be involved in follow-up during the year with selected teams. Three follow-up visits are planned for each team. Each staff member is to make his own arrangements with school systems following these general guide lines:

1. One follow-up visit in October or November

   The purpose of this visit is to help with any problems that the team has encountered and to plan next steps.

2. One follow-up visit in January or early February

   The purpose of this visit is to help the teams assess progress, to reploy for the Spring, and to decide on what date the team may meet during the Spring.

3. One follow-up visit in late April or May

   The purpose of this visit is to discuss their data with team members and to plan a way of organizing and reporting it.

The staff is keenly aware that teams came to the Institute at many different levels of sophistication and that this wide range will continue to be so next Spring. Each team's efforts will be assessed in terms of growth in insight and understanding rather than expecting to evaluate them on any comparative basis.

ROSTER

INTERGROUP WORKSHOP
INSTITUTE ON DESEGREGATION

Staff	Address
Fannie R. Shaftel	School of Education Stanford University Stanford, California
John T. Robinson	San Francisco State College 1600 Holloway Avenue San Francisco 27, California
Elizabeth Brady	Dept. of Education San Fernando State College 1811 Nordhoff Northridge, California
Marie Fielder	Department of Teacher Education School of Education University of California Berkeley, California

Name	Position	
Agee, Mrs. Helen F.	Elem. Teacher	1650 S. Dahlia St. Denver, Colorado 80222
Anderson, Mrs. Margit	Elem. Teacher	4515 N.E. 78th Portland, Oregon
Anthony, Charles	Elem. Teacher	19027 N.E. Couch Lane Portland, Oregon 97230
Arnold, Ora D.	Jr.Hi. Teacher	816 - 57th St. Oakland, California
Boysen, Mrs. Vera	Teacher	375 Topaz St. Redwood City, California
Burson, Buddy L.	Coordinator	2201 Birch St. Denver, Colorado 80222
Cabello, Refugio	Elem. Principal	41104 Alline St. Fremont, California
Carrie, Mrs. Altheda	Elem. Teacher	506 - 11th Ave. San Francisco, California 94118

Clark, Bonnie	Teacher	122 Ward St. Larkspur, California 94939
Darling, Elsie	Teacher	1927 Manhattan Ave. East Palo Alto, California
Davie, Doris E.	Teacher	2230 Durant Ave., Apt. 309 Berkeley, California
Davis, Mrs. Frances R.	Principal	901 E. 13th Ave., Apt. 8A Denver, Colorado 80206
Deal, Elizabeth	Elem. Teacher	1550 Alton, Apt. 304 Aurora, Colorado 80010
Farrell, Bernard	Principal	4052 N.E. 21st St. Portland, 12, Oregon
Felska, Kay	Teacher	Conrad, Montana
Flores, Armando	Staff	1788 Sir Frances Drake Blvd. Fairfax, California
Gerber, Mrs. Mary Frances	Special	2405 N.E. 21st Portland, Oregon
Giles, Sister Mary Bernadette	Teacher	775 Ashbury St. San Francisco, Calif. 94117
Grantham, Virginia	Teacher	16 Una Way, Apt. D Mill Valley, California
Greaves, Jack	Asst. Superintendent	5520 29th N.E. Seattle, Washington
Haguewood, Marian P.	Teacher	5401 Montview Blvd. Denver, Colorado 80207
Hallberg, Mr. E. T.	Coordinator	P.O. Box 551 Las Vegas, Nevada
Hicks, Mrs. Florence	Teacher	1238 Oxford St. Berkeley, California
Hite, Mrs. Melva J.	Teacher	3041 Elm St. Denver, Colorado 80207
Holway, Mr. Michael	Teacher	866 - 34th Ave. San Francisco, Calif. 94121
Jones, Mrs. Elizabeth	Teacher	55 Pierce St. San Francsco, California

Kirchner, Nicholas	Jr.Hi. Teacher	4208 N.E. Couch Portland, Oregon
Knutson, Mrs. Anna	Elem. Teacher	1015 N. Portland Blvd. Portland, Oregon 97217
Krein, Reuben	Teacher	19520 3rd South Seattle, Washington
Manley, James N.	Asst. Principal	3050 S. Bellaire Denver, Colorado 80222
Marshall, Dean	Teacher	24742 Broadmore Ave. Hayward, California
Marston, Mrs. Kathryn	Elem. Teacher	1744 Julian Ct. El Cerrito, California
Mascall, Henry	Principal	2946 N.E. 64th Portland, Oregon
Maycroft, Joyce	Teacher	586 Berry Ave. Hayward, California
Mellon, Emory	Asst. Principal	830 Hayes St., Apt. #106 San Francisco 94117
Muller, Robert B.	Principal	423 - A Litho St. Sausalito, California
Napper, James	Teacher	2497 Warren Rd. Walnut Creek, California
Norwood, Annie	Teacher	733 Van Ert Las Vegas, Nevada
Pech, Ernest E.	Coordinator	4400 E. Colorado Ave. Denver, Colorado 80222
Pooley, Sister DePaul	Teacher	775 Ashbury St. San Francisco, Calif. 94117
Ralph, Loren	Principal	2483 S. Edmunds Seattle, Washington
Rybensky, William	Elem. Principal	940 Altschul Menlo Park, California
Scharetg, John	Vice Principal	605 Colusa Ave. El Cerrito, California

Shandy, Shirley	Elem. Teacher	2423 S.E. 52nd St. Portland, Oregon 97206
Shikamura, Alice	Elem. Teacher	Rt. 1, Box 668, Mary Ave. Sunnyvale, California
Smith, Dale	Teacher	10917 N.E. 1st Place Portland, Oregon
Staley, Mrs. Dorothy	Elem. Teacher	916 Key Route Blvd Albany, California
Strinden, Duane	Hi. School Teacher	717 17th East Seattle, Washington
Stuckey, Sister Timothy	Teacher	775 Ashbury St. San Francisco, Calif. 94117
Thollaug, Mrs. Barbara	Teacher	2635 Mira Vista Dr. El Cerrito, California
Thomson, Robert D.	Principal	31 Wallace Way San Rafael, California
Walker, John	Principal	2102 Gabriel Las Vegas, Nevada
Walker, Thomas C.	Coordinator	6868 Snowden El Cerrito, California
Ward, James	Principal	2618 Adams St. Denver, Colorado
Warner, Mrs. Ila	Teacher	5335 Bayview Ave. Richmond, California
Waxdal, Peggy	Teacher	7340 Earl Ave. Seattle, 7, Washington
Wilson, Joy T.	Teacher	5401 Montview Blvd. Denver, Colorado 80207
Wilson, Sister Mary Patricia	Teacher	775 Ashbury St. San Francisco, California
Wiswell, Edna	Teacher	3031 Bryant Palo Alto, California
York, Margaret	Teacher	1801 North "J", Apt. 201F Las Vegas, California

INTERGROUP WORKSHOP: INSTITUTE ON DESEGREGATION

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

August 2 - 20, 1965

TEAM PROBLEM CENSUS:

(Each team is asked to meet and formulate statements in response to the items listed below)

1. Describe the community from which your school draws its students.

   (The nature of the population, any pertinent historical information, agencies that are active, community organizations that affect the life of the school, etc.)

2. What is a key problem which YOU wish to work on as a team? (A tentative commitment)

TEAM MEMBERS:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

SCHOOL: _____

DISTRICT: _____

PLEASE MAIL BACK PROMPTLY TO: Dr. F. R. Shaftel
Director, Intergroup Workshop
School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

INTERGROUP WORKSHOP: INSTITUTE ON DESEGREGATION

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

August 2 - 20, 1965

INDIVIDUAL PROBLEM CENSUS

1. What do you consider to be the most crucial problem your school faces?

2. What bothers you most in your school situation?

3. If you ask your students what they consider to be the most crucial problems your school faces, what would they say?

4. If you asked parents what they consider to be the most crucial problems your school faces, what would they say?

Your name: _____

Please mail back promptly to:

Dr. F. R. Shaftel
Director, Intergroup Workshop
School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, California

INSTITUTE ON DESEGREGATION
Stanford University

August 1965

GROUP FOLDER CONTENTS: (One to each team)

A. Booklets

1. MINORITY GROUPS AND INTERGROUP RELATIONS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO AREA
by Wilson Record

2. ROLE PLAYING THE PROBLEM STORY
by George and Fannie Shaftel

3. TOWARD EFFECTIVE GROUPING
by Margaret Rasmussen

4. DIAGNOSING HUMAN RELATIONS NEEDS
by Taba, Brady, Robinson and Vickery

5. THE ACT

6. OUT OF MANY
by Oscar Handlin

B. Articles

1. SCHOOL DESEGREGATION: EXPANDING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES TO ALL AMERICANS by Thomas Pettigrew

2. CRISIS IN THE CHILDREN'S FIELD
by Fritz Redl

3. INTERRACIAL MARRIAGE: AN INTERESTING ASPECT OF CURRENT SOCIAL CHANGE

C. Miscellaneous

1. Pencils and paper

D. Reprints (Charles E. Merrill

1. "Guidelines for Testing Minority Group Children"
by Deutsch et al.

2. "A Question of Culture"
by Edmond Gordon

3. "Education for the Culturally Deprived"
by William Wattenberg

4. "Curriculum Adaptations for Culturally Deprived"
by Deborah Wolfe

INSTITUTE ON DESEGRATION

Stanford University

August 1965

INDIVIDUAL FOLDER CONTENTS: (one to each individual)

A. Articles

1. TWENTY_ONE RESEARCH FINDINGS RE CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED YOUTH SUPPORTED BY INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM PRESCHOOL CRITICAL INCIDENT OBSERVATION RECORDS
by N. S. Metfessel and J. S. Foster

B. Bibliography

1. Library hard-back Book Bibliography
2. Paper-back Book Bibliography
3. Article Bibliography

C. Roster

1. Names of the Staff
2. Names of the Participants
3. Addresses of Staff and Participants

D. Miscellaneous

1. Welcome Letter from Professor Shaftel
2. Pads of Working paper.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

INTERGROUP WORKSHOP

INSTITUTE ON DESEGREGATION

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Summer 1965

BOOK BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anastasi, Anne. Differential Psychology. 3rd ed. New York. Macmillan, 1958.

Aptheker, Herbert. American Negro Slave Revolts. International Publishers.

Bardolph, Richard. The Negro Vanguard. Vintage Book

Bloom, B. Stability and Change in Human Characteristics. New York, John Wiley, 1964.

Bloom, B., Davis, A., and Hess, R., eds. Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Boles, R. J. Interaction Process Analysis. Cambridge, Mass. Addison Wesley, 1951.

Bowen, Elenore Smith. Return to Laughter. Doubleday Anchor.

Bradford, Daniel. Black, White and Gray. 1964.

Braithwaite. To Sir with Love.

Carmichael, L., ed. Manual of Child Psychology. New York. John Wiley, 1954.

Crosby, Muriel Estelle. An Adventure in Human Relations.

Dallard, J. Caste and Class in a Southern Town. 2nd ed. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1937.

Davidson, Basil. Black Mother. Little and Brown.

_____. The Last Cities. Little and Brown.

Davis and Dallard. Children of Bondage. Harper and Row.

De Cecco, J.P. Human Learning in the Schools. New York. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Educational Policies Commission. Education and the Disadvantaged American. Washington. N.E.A. 1962.

Eels, K., Davis, A., Havighurst, R.J., Merrick, V.E. and Tyler, R. Intelligence and Cultural Differences. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Flavell, J. H. The Developmental Psychology of Jean Piaget. Princeton. D. Van Nostrand, 1963.

Friedenberg, Edgar. The Vanishing Adolescent.

Giles, H. Harry, The Integrated Classroom. New York. Basic Books. 1962.

Ginzberg, Eli. The Negro Potential. Columbia University Press.

Goodlad, J. I., and R. H. Anderson. The Non-Graded Elementary School. New York. Harcourt, Brace and World. 1963.

Grambs, Jean D. A Guide to School Integration. New York. Public Affairs Committee. 1957.

Hall, Edward Twitchell. The Silent Language.

Hansen, Carl F. Miracle of Social Adjustment: Desegregation in the Washington D. C. Schools. Freedom Pamphlets, A. D. L., 1957.

Holt, J. "How Children Fail." Bloom Hiss, Davis. Comp. Ed. for Cult. Deprived.

Hunt, J. McV. Intelligence and Experience. New York, Ronald Press, 1961

Kephart, N. C. The Slow Learner in the Classroom. Columbus, Ohio. Charles E. Merrill, 1960.

Killens, John. And Then We Heard the Thunder.

King, Martin Luther. Stride Toward Freedom. Harper Row.

Kirk, S. A. Early Education of Mentally Retarded. Illinois. University of Illinois Press, 1958.

Kirk, S. A. and Johnson, G. A. Educating the Retarded Child. Boston. Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1951.

Klausmeier, H. Learning and Human Abilities: Educational Psychology. New York. Harper, 1961.

Klineberg, A. Negro Intelligence and Selective Migration. New York. Columbia University Press. 1935.

Landreth, CAtherine. Psychology of Early Childhood. New York. Alfred Knopf, 1958.

Lewis, Anthony. Portrait of a Decade. Random House.

Lewis, Oscar. Children of Sanchez.

_____. Five Families.

Lindquist, E. J. Design and Analysis of Experiments in Psychology and Education. Boston. Houghton-Mifflin, 1953.

May, Edgar. The Wasted American. Signet Book.

Mayer, M. The Schools. New York. Harper, 1961.

McWilliams, Carey. Brothers Under the Skin.

Montessori, Maria. The Discovery of the Child. Wheaton, Ill. Theosophical Press, 1948.

Myrdal, G. An American Dilemma. New York. Harper and Row, 1962.

Passow, A. H., ed. Education in Depressed Areas. New York. Teachers College Bureau of Publication. 1963.

Pettigrew, Thom. Profile of the American Negro. New York. D. Van Nostrand, 1964.

Piaget, J. The Language and Thought of the Child. 2nd ed. London. Routledge, 1932.

Rambusch, Nancy McCormick. Learning How to Learn: An American Approach to Montessori. Baltimore. Hebian Press, 1962.

Reissman, F. The Culturally Deprived Child. New York, Harper and Row, 1962.

Riese, Hertha. Heal the Hurt Child. University of Chicago, 1962.

Silberman, C. F. Crisis in Black and White. New York. Random House, 1964.

Stampp, Kenneth M. The Peculiar Institution. Vintage.

Tannenbaum, Frank. Slave and Citizens. Vintage.

Terman, L.M. and Aden, Melite H. The Gifted Child Grows Up. California. Stanford University Press, 1947.

Tumin, M. Desegregation: Resistance and Readiness. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1958.

Vernon, P. E. Intelligence and Attainment Tests. New York. Philosophical Library, 1960.

Vygotsky, L. S. Thought and Language. Boston. M.I.T. Press, 1962.

Wallant, Edgar L. The Children at the Gate. 1964.

_____. The Tenants of Moonbloom.

Washburn, Wilcomb E. The Indian and White Man.

Waugh, Evelyn. The Loved One. Dell-Laurel Edition.

Wann, K. D., Dorn, Miriam S., and Liddle, Elizabeth. Fostering Intellectual Development in Young Children. New York. Teacher College Publications, 1962.

Williams, Robin. Strangers Next Door.

Yinger and Simpson. Racial and Cultural Minorities.

Young, Whiteney. To Be Equal. McGraw-Hill, 1964

Zinn, SNCC, The New Abolishionists. Beacon Press. 1964.

Paperback Books

Allport, Grodon W. The Resolution of Intergroup Tensions. National Conference of Chirstians and Jews.

Arnow, Harriette. The Dollmaker. Collier Books.

Baldwin, James. Blues for Mister Charlie. Dell Books.

_____. The Fire Next Time. Dell Books.

Baugh, Dolores, Pulsifer, Marjorie, and Carrillo, Lawrence. Chandler Language-Experience Readers. Chandler Publishing Company.

Bloom, Benjamin S., Bavis, Allison, and Hess, Robert. Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. New York, 1965.

Botkins, B. A. (Editor). Lay My Burden Down. University of Chicago Press Phoenix Books.

Brown, Elenora Smith. Return to Laughter. A Doubleday Anchor Book.

Buckmaster, Henrietta. Let My People Go. Beacon Press. 1959.

Clark, Kenneth B. Prejudice and Your Child. Beacon.

Commission of School Integration. Public School Segregation and Integration in the North. National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials. November, 1963.

Cook, Lloyd Allen, Director. Intergroup Relations in Teacher Education. American Council of Education. 1951.

Corey, Arthur F., Chairman. American Education and the Search for Equal Opportunity. Educational Policies Commission. 1965.

Davis, Ossie. Purlie Victorious. Samuel French, Inc. 1961.

Dorman, Michael. We Shall Overcome. Dell Publishing Co., Inc. 1965.

Duberman, Martin B. In White America. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston. The Riverside Press, Cambridge.

Dunson, Josh. Freedom in the Air: Song Movements of the 60's. International Publishers. New York, 1965.

Ellison, Ralph. Invisible Man. The New American Library. 1964.

Franklin, John Hope. The Emancipation Proclamation. A Doubleday Anchor Book.

Frazier, E. Franklin. Black Bourgeoisie. Collier Books. New York, 1962.

Paperback Books - 2

Grambs, Jean D. Education in a Transition Community. National Conference of Christians and Jews. 1958.

Green, Paul. Five Plays of the South. A Mermaid Dramabook.

Griffin, John Howard. Black Like Me. A Signet Book.

Handlin, Oscar. Fire-Bell in the Night. Beacon Press.

Hare, Nathan and Cox, Oliver C. The Black Anglo Saxons. Marzani and Munsell Publishers.

Harrington, Michael. The Other America. A Penguin Special.

Harris, Marvin. Patterns of Race in the Americas. Walker and Co., 1964.

Himas, Chester. The Third Generation. The New American Library. 1964.

Hunnicutt, C. W., ed. Urban Education and Cultural Deprivation. Syracuse University. 1964.

James, C. L. R. The Black Jacobins. Vintage Books.

Kardiner, Abram and Ovesey, Lionel. The Mark of Opperssion. The World Publishing Company. 1962.

Mack, Raymond W. and Troy S. Duster. Patterns of Minority Relations. Freedom Pamphlets. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith.

Mendelson, Wallace. Discrimination. A Spectrum Book.

Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development. April 1961. Vol. 7, Number 2.

Miller, Warren. The Cool World. Crest Book, 1964.

Motley, Willard. Knock on Any Door. A Signet Book.

Papashvily, George and Helen. Anything Can Happen. Harper & Row, Publishers, New York, 1940.

Pettigrew, Thomas. Epitaph for Jim Crow. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Purdy, James. Malcolm. Avon Book.

Record, Wilson. Minority Groups and Intergroup Relations in the San Francisco Bay Area. Institute of Governmental STudies. 1963.

Rose, Arnold. Social Change and the Negro Problem. Freedom Pamphlets. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Roth, Henry. Call It Sleep. Avon Books.

Roth, Philip. Goodbye, Columbus. Bantam Books. New York, 1959.

Sexton, Patricia Cayo. Education and Income. The Viking Press.

Shaftel, George and Fannie R. Role Playing, the Problem Story: An Approach to Human Relations in the Classroom. National Conference of Christians and Jews. 1952.

Shotwell, Louisa R. Roosevelt Grady. Tempo Books.

Smith, Lillian. Killers of the Dream. Anchor Books.

Stringfellow, William. My People is the Enemy. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Taba, Hilda, and Elkins, Deborah. With Focus on Human Relations. American Council on Education, 1959.

Wakin, Edward. At the Edge of Harlem. William Morrow & Co. New York, 1965.

Warren, Robert Penn. All the King's Men. Bantam Books. New York, 1946.

Weber, Evelyn, (ed) Intermediate Education: Changing Dimensions. Association for Childhood Education International, 1965.

Wong, Jade Snow. Fifth Chinese Daughter. Harper & Row, Publishers. New York. 1965.

Wright, Richard. The Outsider. Harper & Row, Publishers. New York, 1953.

Articles

Ausubel, David P. A Teaching Strategy for Culturally Deprived Pupils: Cognitive and Motivational Considerations.

Bernard, Viola W. School Desegregation -- Some Psychiatric Implications.

Bradley, Gladyce H. Friendships Among Students in Desegregated Schools.

Carlson, Rae. Identification and Personality Structure in Preadolescence.

Chen, Martin K. Intelligence and Bilingualism as Independent Variants in a Study of Junior High School Students of Chinese Descent.

Clark, Kenneth B. Segregated Schools in New York City.

Davidson, Helen W. and Lang. Children's Perceptions of Their Teachers' Feeling Toward Them.

Davis, O. L., Jr. Grouping for Instruction: Some Perspectives

DeBary, Wm. Theodore. Education for a World Community.

Deutsch, Martin. Discussion and Critique of Some Variables in the Social Psychology of School-to-College Transition.

_____. Social and Psychological Perspectives on the Development of Disadvantaged Learner.

_____. What we've Learned About Disadvantaged Children.

Deutsch, Martin and Bert Brown. Social Influences in Negro-White Intelligence Difference.

Deutsch, Martin, et al. Guidelines for Testing Minority Group Children.

Dimitroff, Lillian. Small Group Training for Spanish-Speaking Pupils

Eash, Maurice J. Grouping: What Have We Learned?

Gollins, Eugene S. Developmental Studies of Visual Recognition of Incomplete Objects.

Graff, Virginia and Shirley Feldman. Boys' Club for Middle Readers.

Howell, John J. and Max Weiner. Note on the Equivalence of Alternate Forms of an Achievement Test.

Irvin, Orvis C. Infant Speech: Development of Vowel Sounds.

Johnson, G. Orville. Organizing Instruction and Curriculum Planning for the Socially Disadvantaged.

Knapp, Robert R. The Effectos of Time Limits on the Intelligence Test Performance of Mexican and American Subjects.

Levine, Daniel U. Socio-Economic Attitudinal Correlates of Educational Viewpoint.

Lewis, Hilda P. Written Language Performance of Sixth Grade Children of Low Socio-Economic Status from Bilingual and from Monolingual Backgrounds.

Lombardi, Donald N. Factors Affecting Changes in Attitudes Toward Negroes Among High School Students.

Newton, Eunice Shaed. Planning for the Language Development of Disadvantaged Children and Youth.

Peisach, Estelle Cherry. Children's Comprehension of Teacher and Peer Speech.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. Negro-American Intelligence: A New Look at an Old Controversy.

Raab, Shirley, Deutsch, Freedman. Perceptual Shifting and Set in Normal School Children of Different Reading Achievement Levels.

Rice, Joseph P., Jr. Education for Subcultural Groups.

Riessman, Frank. The Overlooked Positives of Disadvantaged Groups.

Salziner, Suzanne, et.al. Operant Conditioning and Coninuous Speech in Young Children.

Samora, Julian. The Educational Status of a Minority.

Sarason, Irwin G. Test Anxiety and Intellectual Performance.

Saturday Review of Literature, May 15, 1965.

Singleton, Robert. Some Problems in Minority-Group Education in the Los Angeles Public Schools.

Spears, Harold. How an Urban School System Identifies Its Disadvantaged.

Spruill, Albert W. The Negro Teacher in the Process of Desegregation of Schools.

Stallings, Frank H. A Study of the Immediate Effects of Integration on Scholastic Achievement in the Louisville Public Schools.

Thompson, Daniel C. Evaluation as a Factor in Planning Programs for the Culturally Disadvantaged.

Thompson, Hildegard. The Education of American Indians.

Articles - 3

Wax, Murray. American Indian Education as a Cultural Transaction.

Webster, Stalen W. The Influence of Interracial Contact on Social Acceptance in a Newly Integrated School.

Weiner, Max and Walter Murray. Another Look at the Culturally Deprived and Their Levels of Aspiration.

Weiner, Max and Shirley Feldman. Validation Studies of a Reading Prognosis Test for Children of Lower and Middle S-E Status.

Weiner, Max and Sigmund Tobias. Chance Factors in the Interpretation of a Group Administered Multiple-Choice Tests.

Wilkerson, Doxey A. Prevailing and Needed Emphasis in Research on the Education of Disadvantaged Children and Youth.

Wolff, Max. Segregation in the Schools of Gary, Indiana.

August 10, 1965

Stanford University
Institute on Desegregation

REACTION SHEET

1. During the first eight days of the Institute, I have found most valuable:

2. What has bothered me somewhat is:

3. As I look ahead to the remaining week and one-half, I <u>plan</u> to:

   a) Read

   b) Talk to

   c) Listen to

   d) Make plans for my own fall assignment to

4. I would most like to have these kinds of help during the remaining sessions:

   a) Total group meetings:

   b) For my district team:

   c) For myself individually:

41

Use other side, if you wish.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE ON DESEGREGATION

August, 1965

Final Reaction Sheet

1. As I look back over the last three weeks, what has been personally most meaningful is:

2. Three things I intend to do during the coming school year are:

3. I can do these best if I can have the following kinds of help (from Instiute staff, from personnel in my district, from other participants):

4. If a similar Institute is planned for 1966, I suggest that

5. My own role in relation to such an Institute would be:

INSTITUTE ON DESEGREGATION

Stanford University
Stanford, California

"FUN NIGHT"

August 19, 1965
Serra Hall Lounge
7:30 p.m.

Greetings . . . . . .Doris E. Davie
Program Chairman

Master of Ceremonies . . . . . .Ernest Pech

Community Singing . . . . . .(about 3 or 4) . . . . . .Bob Muller

Vocal Trio Selections . . . . . .The Nuns
Sis. DePaul Pooley, Sis. Timothy Stuckey, Sis. Mary P. Wilson

Jazz Selection . . . . . .Robert Muller
Pianist

Soloist . . . . . .Doris E. Davie
Divinites Du Styx . . . . . by Gluck
He's Got the Whole World In His Hands . . . Arr. H. Forest

Drama Presentation . . . . . ."Every Child"
Adapted by Ora Arnold from the book Killers of the Dream
Narrator . . . . . James Napper
Cast Members:

Elsie Darling	Dorothy Staley
Vera Boysen	Alice Shikamura
Barbara Thollaug	Sister De Paul Pooley
Florence Hicks	Armando Flores
Dean Marshall	Sister Mary Patricia Wilson
Betty Brady	Sister Timothy Stukey
	Ted Hallberg

A Happening . . . . . Robert Muller

Community Singing . . . . . Robert Muller

"The Betty Brady Special" . . . . . Betty Brady

Closing Remarks . . . . . Ernest E. Pech

* * * * * * * *

Piano Accompaists: Sister Mary Bernadette Giles
Robert Muller

FINAL REPORT

INTERGROUP WORKSHOP FOR SPECIAL TRAINING ON PROBLEMS OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION AND FOLLOW-UP IN PARTICIPATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Under a Grant of U.S.O.E., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, thrcugh Provision of Title IV, Section 404, of Public Law 88-352, The Civil Rights Act of 1964

Reported by: Fannie k. Shaftel, Director

Program Director: Fannie R. Shaftel

Contract Number: O.E. 5-37-025
P.L. 88-352, Title IV, Section 404
The Civil Rights Act of 1964

Date Transmitted: November 1, 1966

PART I - SUMMER INSTITUTE

Planning phase. The Director worked during the month of May organizing the Workshop, arranging for the selection of school systems and teams, conferring with staff members individually and, on May 23rd, conducting a day's planning session with the staff. (There was also much preliminary informal planning and contact of school systems between February and May.)

Training phase. The training workshop was held at Stanford University as a live-in experience in a dormitory from August 2nd through August 20th, 1965.

Participants. Participants consisted of thirteen teams of teachers, administrators and supervisors from ten school districts of the West: fifty-six in all, plus a consultant team of four teachers from a San Francisco parochial school. The districts represented were:

California: Berkeley Unified School District (sponsored by Alameda County)
New Haven Unified School District (sponsored by Alameda County)
Ravenswood School District
Richmond School District - two teams
San Francisco Unified School District
San Francisco parochial schools (consultant team)

Colorado: Denver Public Schools - two teams

Nevada: Clark County School District

Oregon: Portland Public Schools - two teams

Washington: Seattle School District #1

There were seven central staff personnel, including an assistant superintendent, coordinators and special teachers; fourteen principals and vice principals. The main group were elementary, junior and senior high school teachers. In this total group there were twelve Negro-Americans, two Mexican-Americans, and one Japanese-American.

Objectives of the program. The intensive preparation of thirteen school teams consisting of teachers and their administrators (principal or vice principal) and, in some instances a central staff member, from key cities of the West, for the desegregation of Negro, Mexican-American, Indian and other de facto segregated children. The focus was on (1) helping such children enter the wider community and integrated school situations; (2) developing support for this in the majority groups; and (3) helping teachers to acquire sensitivities, techniques, and materials for this task.

Among the tasks developed for this Workshop were (a) a study of the nature of the Negro Revolution and the Civil Rights Movement, (b) an analysis of stereotypical notions of Negro life and of Mexican-American, Indian and other disadvantaged sub-cultures, (c) an exploration with participants of their own ambivalence and anxiety about Negro, Mexican-American and lower class populations, (d) an analysis of problems of grouping children for learning, and (e) a study of effective ways of learning for children who are disadvantaged for various reasons, and (f) the development of plans of action by each team.

Procedures. Each team and each participant filled out a problem census before arrival at the Workshop, which was the basis for initial staff planning. Two general guidelines were used: (a) the Institute was structured around the problems which participants identified for themselves, with the staff identifying "blind spots" and expanding the consideration of original problem statements and (b) the staff undertook the task of extending basic understandings of the tasks of desegregation and integration.

Bibliographies, materials such as tapes, recordings, teaching guides, and key books were provided in a workshop library and individual kits of selected articles and pamphlets were distributed to each team. At the end of the Workshop, each team selected from the books, pamphlets and articles, materials equivalent to the expenditure of $5.00 per team member to take back to their schools as a basic library.

The staff planned a tentative schedule for the first week which was subject to revision as new needs emerged. First meetings were focused on team problems and plans, interspersed with presentations by visiting consultants and staff designed to pose the general tasks and problems of desegregation and serve as "complacency shockers." Total group sessions, half group sessions and team sessions were used the first week. Friday of that week was devoted to a field trip to a redevelopment project in San Francisco and a guided walk-around in one or more of the ten inner city neighborhoods. Expert assistance was provided by individuals involved in the project. Early in the second week a reaction sheet was distributed and used as a guide for planning the remaining days of the Institute.

The second week focused on the curricular tasks of desegregation. Visiting consultants consisted of a professor of science education reporting on NSF research on learning problems of disadvantaged children and three teachers who gave case studies and reports on special teaching projects. Other consultants spoke on more general topics.

Films were used by small groups and teams as desired. A "listening room" was also set up and actively used for listening to tapes. A library of paper back books and recent articles was readily available to the participants.

The final week was focused on team work, and small interest group sessions centered around curricular media, processes, and materials.

Since this was a live-in Workshop, there many informal gatherings, including a group sing and a final party. Participants also enjoyed programs of the Mozart Festival of the University.

Workshop evaluation sheets were used as well as the forms from Howard University for evaluative purposes.

Results and conclusions. It was the consensus of the staff that much individual growth was made in sensitivity, awareness of the breadth of the task and in confronting the needs of each team's school. However, there was a wide range in curricular sophistication and the staff anticipated the need for much training in curriculum development during the school year. There was only one person who rejected the experience on the final evaluation. Most participants expressed satisfaction with their new insights and skills.

PART II - FOLLOW-UP PROGRAM: SCHOOL YEAR 1965-1966

It was planned that each of the four regular staff members would be involved in the follow-up during the year with the teams they were responsible for during the summer institute. Three two-day follow-up visits in their schools were planned for each team. It was proposed that the follow-up visits would use the following format:

1. One follow-up visit in October or November to help with any problems the teams had encountered and to plan next steps.
2. One follow-up visit in January or early February

to help the teams assess progress and to reploy for the spring semester.

3. One follow-up visit in late April or May to discuss their data with team members and to plan a way of organizing and reporting results.

The individual staff members were to plan their own visiting schedules with the teams and their school districts, accommodating to their own work schedules. Several unanticipated factors modified these plans. Since each staff member was offering this field service on his own time, with no released time from his regular work load, finding time for follow-up visits became increasingly difficult to manage. This problem was further complicated by the growing requests from school districts, Civil Rights groups and Human Relations Commissions for help in planning and participating in community meetings on the problems and tasks of desegregation.

As a result of these factors, it was not possible to fully realize the plan for three two-day visits to each team. However, each district was visited at least two times, with the exception of Seattle which was visited only one half-day by the director for a conference with central administration personnel. The staff member responsible for Seattle was so pressed for help by other teams in areas facing immediate critical problems that she was not able to keep to her schedule.

However, in spite of these difficulties, the staff felt that the field visits were very useful to the teams and that staff members had a good and increasing relationship with the administrative personnel responsible for human relations and desegregation programs. The following

is a description of types of service performed by the institute staff in their field visits: Forms of field service:

1. Visited school communities and the school in order to better understand the setting in which the teams were working.
2. Observed in the classrooms of team members and consulted with those teachers afterwards, helping them to further diagnose the needs of their children, making suggestions for possible changes in either teaching procedures or curriculum content.
3. Met with the administrators on the teams, to discuss their problems and tasks.
4. Met with faculties in the schools of teams to present present professional research and theory regarding both tasks of desegregation and teaching children who may be educationally disadvantaged.
5. In several school districts the staff:
   a. Met with central administration officials at their invitation, to explore together the tasks of desegregation.
   b. Met with city-wide groups of teachers and/or school principals to view together the growing body of theory and practice in desegregation and integration of school populations.
   c. Participated in community programs that were designed to gain public understanding and support of the school district desegregation efforts and needs.
   d. Helped central administration personnel to design proposals for application for federal education funds.

As a result of these efforts and the activities which the teams were engaged in as a product of their institute planning, the following school system activities were developed:

1. A program of individualized reading was instituted by one team and developed with the help of a principal from the same school system who was also a participant in the intitute.
2. New-child and parent orientation programs were initiated at the beginning of the fall semester in several schools.
3. Parent conference programs were experimented with in one school.
4. A series of discussion meetings for interested parents was held in a school which is in a neighborhood of rapid change in population composition. The topics of these meetings was "How Can We Keep Our Neighborhood Integrated?"
5. The primary grade teachers of one school developed a language experience program.
6. An experimental second grade program was carried out with 23 non-readers. A large number of new experiences formed a basis for work in the language arts. Children's stories of their experiences as well as creative stories were tape-recorded and all children could listen to the stories recorded by other children. This developed into a broadened reading program focused on self-enhancement and developing a feeling of competence. All 23 children experienced success in reading during this school year. The success of this program has resulted in plans to extend it for 1966-1967.

7. A recreation program for fathers (predominently new Negro families moving into a formerly all white area) was started in our school with a few men. It has now grown to between 50 and 60 fathers in the neighborhood. The mothers are now organizing a parallel group. The fathers' group volunteered and carried through the kindergarten "Round Up" in the spring. They plan further activities this coming year.

8. A plan was developed in one school for having new children introduced to the school and its facilities by a teacher-counselor. A record is kept of their experiences and is passed on to their regular teacher when they are placed in a classroom. The next step, already begun by one teacher, is to involve the parent group in the orientation of new families.

9. Several other schools have also instituted parent participation programs in neighborhoods of rapid turn-over of populations, in recognition of the need for greater parent involvement because of the increasing impersonality of the neighborhood. One school has been especially successful in identifying and using parent skills in a predominantly lower class community. This plan is now being applied to a high school by the principal who was formerly the principal of the elementary school in which the plan originated. A new program for the parents and students of the incoming tenth grade is being initiated on the same principles as the elementary program.

10. Two teams from one school system, with the help of the Institute staff, planned and wrote a proposal which their superintendent

submitted to the U.S.O.E. for an institute on desegregation for their school system. This was modelled after the Stanford institute. Not only have the teachers and administrators on the two teams exerted real leadership in their school district; they have also succeeded in involving many others as well as several of the Stanford Institute staff members. The district insitute was successfully held during the summer of 1966.

11. Some team members participated in leadership roles in their schools and districts, serving on curriculum and policy committees as well as citizen's advisory committees and community action programs.

12. One administrator worked on opening up channels of communication with his community and reports that he now realizes how important this was to progress in the school program.

13. One district is paying teachers to work during the summer re-writing teaching units and reading materials for appropriate content and reading levels. This district is also providing time off during the school year for building staff meetings.

Needs that Emerged:

The opportunity to follow the institute teams during the school year proved to be an important aspect of the growth of those team members.

Field observations of teachers in their schools and class rooms enabled the institute staff to be specifically helpful to each team member. In some instances, teachers needed only the encouragement of a staff member to initiate or continue to develop a new program. In other instances further diagnosis of a classroom or school situation was needed before a potentially good plan could be successfully launched. In some situations

it became increasingly clear that the many as yet unsolved problems of the school district made the well-laid plans of team members impossible to realize. Here staff consultations with district officials often proved helpful.

The importance of training teams which included the school administrators was demonstrated in a number of districts where a large enough team, four or five teachers and the school principal, were working together. On returning to their school, there was evidence of real ferment and change in the school. In those schools where one or two teachers were the team, they often found themselves isolated or relatively non-influential in their schools.

Gradually, during the school year a number of needs became evident to the staff. These are listed below:

1. While team members evidenced much more understanding of their children and a growing ability to communicate with them, these teachers were often operating a curriculum that was unrelated to the lives and experiences of their students. They needed a more "intimate" curriculum.
2. There was a heavy emphasis on remediation and on compensatory procedures that too often placed the focus on the "lacks" of students rather than on helping them to utilize their own experiences and strengths as competency spring boards to further learning.
3. Well intentioned teachers often lacked the training in action techniques that children from socially disadvantaged environments could respond to with satisfaction.

4. The behavior problems in the classroom which resulted from learning tasks which were not meaningful or satisfying to the children often reduced good teachers to resort to desperate disciplinary acts. They needed help in seeing the relationship between discipline and curriculum.
5. Many schools were buying new commercially prepared programs hopefully but with little or poor criteria to guide their purchase decisions.
6. Team members needed help in learning how to relate their new found insights to their colleagues in acceptable ways.
7. The very idea of innovation, of experimenting systematically with new learning experiences designed for their own school populations, intimidated teachers. They continued, often, to feel "safe" with conventional programs. Yet the few teams who ventured into new programs experienced exhilarating success. In the non-reading second grade previously reported, every child learned to read!
8. The team members were continually discouraged, in some schools, by the non-professional attitudes of their colleagues. In one district, the teachers seemed to lack a clear role concept, they were "teachers in flight" --- passing through on their way to something "better" (!).
9. Many principals and vice principals evidenced a real need for expert consulation and an opportunity to think through their many problems with sympathetic, skilled support.
10. The pressures upon the school by various elements in rapidly

changing communities indicated a need for admintrator skills in mobilizing community leadership in solving problems the school alone could not solve.

11. Both experienced and inexperienced teachers needed orientation to the life styles of their student populations.

In summary, the institute staff was able to offer some very much needed support and counsel to the school teams, and, often, on invitation, to the school districts.

One handicap, which became increasingly clear as the school year progressed, was that since staff members were carrying the field work as an additional work load on top of their regular jobs, they were limited in time and energy and could not give as much time and help as was needed. It is the consensus of our staff that some members should have released some time from their jobs in order to function most effectively in the follow-up work of an institute.

In analyzing the needs that became evident, it was concluded that a training institute on desegregation probably was a two or three-phase program which might consist of (a) an initial workshop on orientation to the tasks involved and possible next steps, (b) field work, with institute support, in initiating new ideas and (c) a follow-up institute which could be highly focused on the now specific tasks the teachers would have identified for themselves. Less than this results in initial hopes followed by frustrations that can often lead to despair and discouragement.

PROFESSIONAL STAFF PERSONNEL

Director:	Fannie R. Shaftel Associate Professor of Education Stanford University
Associate Director:	John T. Robinson Professor of Education San Francisco State College
Staff Members:	Elizabeth Brady Associate Professor of Education San Fernando Valley State College
	Marie Fielder Division of Teacher Education University of California, Berkeley

END